26

27

28

THOMAS ERICSSON, ESQ.
Nevada Bar No. 4982
ORONOZ, ERICSSON & GAFFNEY, LLC
1050 Indigo Drive, Suite 120
Las Vegas, Nevada 89145
Telephone: (702) 878-2889
Facsimile: (702) 522-1542
tom@oronozlawyers.com
Attorneys for Defendant Peraza

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

VS.

FRANKIE ALLEN PERAZA,

Defendant.

CASE NO.: 2:14-cr-00229-APG-NJK

STIPULATION TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE OBJECTIONS TO THE MAGISTRATE COURT'S REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION [Dkt. 103]

### **ORDER**

IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED AND AGREED by Defendant Frankie Allen Peraza, by and through his attorney, Thomas A. Ericsson, Esq., and Daniel G. Bogden, United States Attorney, and Cristina D. Silva and Elham Roohani, Assistant United States Attorneys, counsel for the United States of America, that the date for the defendant to file objections to the Magistrate's Report and Recommendation [Dkt. 103] be extended for an additional two weeks, up to and including December 30, 2016.

 On September 7, 2016, Magistrate Nancy J. Koppe filed her Report and Recommendation and recommended that Defendant's Motion to Suppress Statement [Dkt. 61] be denied.

- 2. Defense Counsel requires additional time to finalize the objections and consult with Mr. Peraza, who has requested that he be able to review the Objections before they are submitted to the court.
- 3. Defense counsel has been out of the office for nearly two weeks due to the flu and has been unable to visit Mr. Peraza who is in custody in Pahrump, Nevada, to discuss any changes or concerns he has with the Objections.
- 4. Defendant Frankie Peraza is in custody, and he has no objection to the extension of time.
- 5. Counsel has spoken with AUSA Elham Roohani, and she has no objection to the extension of time.
- 6. The additional time requested herein is not sought for purposes of delay, but merely to allow defense counsel adequate time to supplement Defendant's objections, taking into account due diligence and illness issues.
- 7. Additionally, denial of this request for continuance could result in a miscarriage of justice.

DATED: December 16, 2016.

## /s/ Thomas A. Ericsson

Thomas A. Ericsson, Esq.
Oronoz, Ericsson & Gaffney, LLC
1050 Indigo Drive, Suite 120
Las Vegas, Nevada, 89145
Attorney for Defendant

### /s/ Elham Roohani

ELHAM ROOHANI, Esq. 501 Las Vegas Blvd. South, Suite 1100 Las Vegas, Nevada, 89101 Attorney for the United States of America

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, Plaintiff,	)	
	) CASE NO.:	2:14-cr-00229-APG-NJK
VS.	)	
FRANKIE PERAZA,	)	
Defendant.	)	
	)	
	)	
	)	

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

Based on the pending Stipulation of counsel, and good cause appearing therefore, the Court finds that:

- 1. On September 7, 2016, Magistrate Nancy J. Koppe filed her Report and Recommendation and recommended that Defendant's Motion to Suppress Statement [Dkt. 61] be denied.
- 2. Defense Counsel requires additional time to finalize the objections and consult with Mr. Peraza, who has requested that he be able to review the Objections before they are submitted to the court.
- 3. Defense counsel has been out of the office for nearly two weeks due to the flu and has been unable to visit Mr. Peraza who is in custody in Pahrump, Nevada, to discuss any changes or concerns he has with the Objections.
- 4. Defendant Frankie Peraza is in custody, and he has no objection to the extension of time.
- 5. Counsel has spoken with AUSA Elham Roohani, and she has no objection to the extension of time.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 6. The additional time requested herein is not sought for purposes of delay, but merely to allow defense counsel adequate time to supplement Defendant's objections, taking into account due diligence and illness issues.
- 7. Additionally, denial of this request for continuance could result in a miscarriage of justice.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

For all of the above-stated reasons, the ends of justice would best be served by a continuance of the Defendant's deadline to file objections. The additional time requested herein is not sought for purposes of delay, taking into account due diligence. The failure to grant said continuance would likely result in a miscarriage of justice.

## **ORDER**

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the previously-scheduled deadline for the Defendant to file objections to the Magistrate's Report and Recommendation (Dkt. 103) is extended until December 30, 2016.

Dated: December 19, 2016.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE